



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

worth, and Hester. When put into the mouths of the characters, the phrase is used only by Hester and Dimmesdale. Such designed coincidence—the “seven years of outlaw and ignominy” matching by number the law broken by “the pastor and his parishioner”—without any comment by the author showing that he was aware of it, would be quite natural to the subtle simplicity of Hawthorne.

E. C. Ross.

Miami University.

BRIEF MENTION

A Study of Metre, by T. S. Omond (Reprinted from the first edition. London: Alexander Moring, The De La More Press, 1920). The Introductory note to the first edition of this work was dated January, 1903. After the interval of almost two decades the author resubmits his volume to the public with no changes “beyond trifling verbal corrections, . . . feeling that a book once issued is the property of the public.” But the critical press attests the fact that the interval has for him not been one of idleness in respect of his devotion to the study of English prosody. Besides he has recently recast and brought “down to date” his *English Metrists* (Clarendon Press, 1921). The writer of this notice also takes pleasure in the acknowledgment that thru an interchange of letters he has been gratified by Mr. Omond’s gentle, earnest, and fair-minded attitude to his colleagues in the study of his favorite subject. So scrupulous is Mr. Omond, with no aversion to readjustments of his convictions, that one cannot quarrel with him for a persistent and confident advocacy of judgments at which he has arrived thru honest endeavor. His is not the spirit of the intransigent. He rather seems to give to his positive statements the air of an invitation to carry the discussion into closer approximation of the complete truth. If, in the following paragraphs, necessary brevity will induce a somewhat absolute form of expression, Mr. Omond will be least inclined to misinterpret the manner.

Is the subject of English versification then one that has the connotations of a quarrel? It is. This is because an historical subject is prevailingly treated in an unhistorical manner; the evidence of centuries is disregarded, and the argument is based on subjective and vaguely preferred impressions, or on extemporized life-long convictions. In an analogous way, popular etymologies take a strong hold on the untrained mind, which is not easily persuaded that the plain meaning of Welsh Rare-bit is really no meaning at all. It would be gratifying to find Mr. Omond following the historical method. His recognition of accent as the *ictus metricus* would have taken on its complete meaning in the light of an historical consideration of the principles of English accentuation. Moreover, in that light the following statements

would have been greatly altered: "Milton's blank verse normally carries five accents, yet all critics [Is this true?] agree that there are lines in *Paradise Lost* with only four. How do such lines remain metrical? They remain so because each line consists of five periods, though in the case assumed not every period is signalized by accent. Periodicity is the essential quality, accentuation its usual but not invariable exponent" (p. 24). But for every line of 'only four' stresses the established list of accents available for stress would supply the required fifth stress.

The structural foot (or 'period' as Mr. Omond prefers to call it) is always marked off by some historically valid sort of accent functioning as stress (ictus). The accents available for this office are various. This is made plain in Bright and Miller's *Elements of English Versification* (BM.). But metrists, including Mr. Omond, are slow to learn the lesson thoroly. When, for example, in one of his letters to the press, Mr. Omond cites the line from Pope, "Or garden, tempting with forbidden fruit," and declares that "no grown person lays much stress on *with*," he may be asked what he means by "much stress." He cannot mean 'no stress'; and if by stress he means ictus, as he should do, he admits the required ictus. And it is the valid ictus of relational words (BM. § 47). This is a concession to 'routine scansion,' which, in another detached letter to the press (*The Times*, Lit. Sup. March 2, 1921), he recognizes as "the primary basis of metre," and adds "that we never can get altogether away from it." In this instance he is brought to admit the available stress of relational words, but merely as means for holding up the form, by not agreeing with Ruskin's parents in their disapproval of the child's (Ruskin's) recital of

Shall any following spring revive
The ashes of the urn

He would not have this stress exaggerated in a childish fashion. No one would. But the child has put the stress, tho it may wrongly be "much stress," at the right place.

In the letter just cited, Mr. Omond shows a wavering in judgment that would be corrected by a less trammelled observation of poetic conventions and by a perception of the inherent character and availability for ictus of the secondary word-accents. It is asked whether in the same line a word can show a variation of stress, as in "A *divine* presence in a place *divine*." The poets say it is admissible and produces admirable effects. Then "a crucial instance" is taken from Shelley: "I love all that thou *lovest*" (riming with *drest*). The comment runs: it is reported that the poetess Mme. Declaux "distinctly said *lovést*. Those who read . . . *lovést* are simply shirking the difficulty. The question is evidently not one to be settled offhand, and readers may be left to consider

it for themselves, recalling further examples, which are easily found." But the question is definitely answered by the "easily found" examples (BM. p. 64). A theory must of course stand the test of 'crucial instances.'

A verse is a succession of syllables, which, like a gimp cord, has a sustaining wire running thru it. The wire carries the pulsations of stress according to both the plainer and the more subtle sense-accent of the syllables, and so keeps the verse running true to the rhythm-signature. The metrist must agree with the poet in perceiving that in versification the language is under the dominion of an art that is not the art of prose-utterance. The more subtle accents, maintained thru centuries but always in prose subject to neglect, except when called up in some exigency of accentuation, these in verse are lifted into the function of stress as the poet's rhetoric of sense may require. Briefly that is the whole story, but to understand the full force of the statement one must undergo the discipline of training in the long but consistent history of the principles of English accentuation. No other basis will sustain a sound theory of the conventionalities of versification, as they have been observed thru centuries.

The present notice of Mr. Omond's reprinted treatise shall be restricted to a questioning of his fundamental contention. That this questioning is implied in what already has been stated will be perceived when it is observed that Mr. Omond builds his theory upon the assumption that the structural unit (the foot) is a time-unit. He accordingly scans by a subjective division of a verse into its "time-spaces or periods of duration, in which the syllables are, as it were, embedded." This involves a disregard of the historic stress-permissibilities of the language and of the finer sense-rhetoric of poetry, and leads to an admission of pauses that renders his theory unfruitful of a codification of the undeniably simple rules for the making of a normally rhythmic verse. Accentuation in its complete range of degrees provides for the equal time-units, and is therefore the primary factor in English versification.

Mr. Omond misunderstands or rather misinterprets scansion according to rhythm-signature, which is also called routine-scansion. To him the method is an artificial or mechanical syllable-counting. Now, routine-scansion has its analogue in reading a musical composition, in which there is a note-counting, but under the law of the regular recurrence of the 'beats.' Pauses are, of course, used structurally in both 'notations,' so too the resolution of the 'note' whether under the stress or in the 'thesis.' But the regular recurrence of the 'beat' must be maintained in both arts, and the 'beats' must fall at regular intervals of time. This is the structural fact in versification, and it is not invalidated by that class of pauses "voluntary and optional" that may be made in reading a verse. Mr. Omond says rightly of these pauses: "one reader

makes them and another leaves them out; the same reader will vary them at different times. These surely cannot be parts of structure" (p. 7).

One might have expected Mr. Omond's excellent report, with discerning comments, of the experiments made in the imitation of classic versification (*English Metrists*, chap. 1) to have shown him that the subtle laws of accentuation are to be primarily justified in the marking off of the "isochronous periods" of English rhythm. Moreover, he is surprisingly confident in contending for the novelty of his contention that rhythm moves with isochronous steps. But is this not universally taken for granted, and often enough plainly stated, that verse-rhythm responds to the beat of the baton? Notice, for example, Gayley and Young's *English Poetry, its Principles and Progress* (1904, latest impression 1908), Intro. § 7: "The recurrence of identity at regular time or space intervals which pleases us when it characterizes thought and natural movements and forms, . . . the poet attempts to represent in the materials of language. . . . we note that the rhythm regularly ascends to the stress; and that the syllables capable of receiving accent [should be 'stress'] have been ordered so that each is separated from the next by a light or unstressed syllable" (referring to the chosen example in iambic measure). And this from BM. § 4: "But the term 'rhythmic motion' is also applied to sensations of hearing. . . . Measured rhythm underlies the art of versification as well as the art of music. A verse is so constructed that its beats, or verse-stresses, fall at regular intervals of time, dividing the verse into equal time-units."

J. W. B.

The Dramatic Associations of the Easter Sepulchre. By Karl Young (University of Wisconsin Studies in Language and Literature, No. 10. Madison, 1920). This study, despite its somewhat misleading title, is chiefly devoted to a consideration of the two medieval observances of Good Friday and Easter Sunday known as the *Depositio* and *Elevatio*, respectively. A number of texts are printed for the first time and the origins of the ceremonies as well as their relation to the *Visitatio Sepulchri* are investigated.

Professor Young connects the *Depositio Hostiae* with the custom of reserving the host consecrated on Holy Thursday for the Missa Praesantificationum of Good Friday in some sort of receptacle associated with the idea of burial. He traces the laying down of a cross, with or without the host, to the influence of the *Adoratio Crucis*, one of the oldest observances of Holy Week. The *Elevatio* is regarded as a natural sequel to the *Depositio*.

Whether the use of the host preceded that of the cross in these ceremonies, or vice versa, we are not told, but the order adopted

in the discussion is followed in printing the texts, that is, the ceremonies involving the use of the host precede those in which the cross is used. Since it has hitherto been quite generally assumed, especially in view of the close connection between the *Adoratio* and the *Depositio* (cf. Chambers, *Mediaeval Stage*, II, 21) that the burying of a cross antedates that of a host, some discussion of this point would have been welcome.

The chronological relations between the *Depositio-Elevatio*, the Easter sepulchre, and the *Visitatio* are somewhat more fully indicated. According to the author, the *Depositio* and *Elevatio* apparently arose in the tenth century and became associated with a *sepulchrum* which "was already at hand for adoption" (p. 127). Altho these ceremonies, like the *Visitatio*, are extra-liturgical, nevertheless, unlike it, they are completely liturgical in content, and impersonation never took place in them. In other words, whatever the *Depositio* and *Elevatio* may indirectly have contributed to the medieval stage, they themselves never became true drama. From these facts it is plausibly inferred that the *Visitatio* which, also during the tenth century, was brought into connection with the sepulchre, is a later development than the more stereotyped *Depositio* and *Elevatio*.

The value of this study lies less in its conclusions—most of which indeed had been anticipated by Chambers—than in its systematic presentation of new as well as old material and its re-investigation of the subject in the light of this presentation. Professor Young never allows himself to be tempted into making premature generalizations. One cannot refrain from hoping, therefore, that he may presently give us a history of the liturgical drama as a whole which will summarize and correlate the results of his many important contributions in this field.

G. F.

The Captives; or The Lost Recovered. By Thomas Heywood. Edited by Alexander Corbin Judson (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1921), renders generally accessible another of the plays that have for nearly forty years been locked up, out of reach of all students save those who are near the larger libraries, in one of the volumes of the late A. H. Bullen's *Collection of Old English Plays*, 1885. Last year I welcomed the reprint (by the Princeton University Press) of another of Bullen's plays: *Charlemagne*, edited by Professor Schoell; and it is a pleasure to welcome now this companion volume. The play is printed from the contemporary manuscript copy in Egerton Ms. 1994, in the British Museum. Professor Judson has used rotographs of the manuscript and has been able to correct a number of misreadings that crept into Bullen's text. More than that, he is able to furnish con-

vincing proofs of the fact that had previously been suspected by the authorities of the Museum; namely, that the manuscript is a holograph of Thomas Heywood himself, with a number of corrections and additions in a later handwriting. With regard to sources he has no absolutely new facts to add. The main plot derives from Plautus' *Rudens*; the extent of Heywood's indebtedness, often going so far as close verbal copying, is indicated in the notes. Professor Judson has in this part of his work made use of the researches of Allan H. Gilbert ("Thomas Heywood's Debt to Plautus," *Jour. Eng. and Germ. Phil.* XII). Mr. Bullen was not able to indicate the source of the curious farcical and *macabre* sub-plot of the murdered friar. In 1898 Professor Kittredge printed a note on this subject, pointing out that the underplot was a version of the Old French *fabliau* of "Le Prêtre qu'on porte." It was not noted at the time and it has remained to be noted by Professor Judson that two years earlier, in 1896, Professor Koeppel had indicated (in *Archiv*, xcvii) the precise source, a *novella* by Masuccio di Salerno, of which the French *fabliau* and the English "Merry Jest of Dan Hew of Leicestre" are quite similar versions.—The volume is of very pleasing appearance and is admirably printed; I have noted no error save "Dr. A. H. Ward" for "A. W. Ward" (p. 14).

S. C. C.

Lanson's *Manuel bibliographique de la littérature française moderne* needs no description in these columns. From the time of its first appearance it has been an indispensable aid in study and investigation. We now welcome with keen interest the new edition which has just appeared ("Nouvelle édition, revue et augmentée," Paris, Hachette, 1921, xxxii + 1820 pp.). Like the preceding edition, it is issued in five separate parts, and also in a single volume (80 francs). The first three parts are a reprint of the 1914 issue. Part 4 (Nineteenth Century) contains at the end an additional section of ten pages (1526-36) on war-literature. Part 5 is made up of the Supplement and the Index. The supplement, already present in 1914, has been revised and expanded: many items which had previously been overlooked or which belong to the period since the last edition have been added, so that instead of 130 pages the supplement now requires 202 pages. The index has been revised to include this new material.

Those who wish to bring their old edition up to date can do so by obtaining Part 4 (30 fr.) and Part 5 (15 fr.), or, if they do not require the section on war-literature, by adding to their present volume only Part 5. Libraries would do well to purchase the complete new edition.

E. C. A.